DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 688 EA 012 805

TITLE	Human Relations: A Guide for Leadership Training in the Public Schools. Summary Report on a Project with the Syracuse, New York, School System.
INSTITUTION	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Community Relations Service.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 027-000-00940-9: $2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies: *Desegregation Plans: Elementary Education: *Human Relations Programs: *Models: Program Descriptions: *Team Training: *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Syracuse City Schools NY

ABSTRACT

This publication was prepared as a guide to dealing with school human relations problems, with a focus on leadership training. It describes one method of organizing and training teams of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and others to pursue desirable human relations goals. The model program presented here was developed to aid desegregation in the Syracuse (New York) elementary schools. Thus, the publication describes the Syracuse program's objectives, development, implementation, and accomplishments. Descriptions are also given of the use of the Syracuse model in other cities. The appendix offers a checklist for diagnosing school climate. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Community Relations Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Human Relations: A Guide for Leadership Training in the Public Schools

Summary Report on a Project with the Syracuse, New York, School System

ED189688

EA 012 805

2

The Community Relations Service (CRS) is a U.S. Department of Justice agency created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to help communities resolve disputes, disagreements, or difficulties growing out of discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin.

The agency frequently assists in the resolution of school human relations problems. As a conciliator and mediator of racial conflict, it has experience with many of the problems that beset the nation's schools today.

CRS helps school officials and community residents solve problems through conflict resolution when required, and through a wide range of technical assistance that is an integral part of its arsenal of conciliation-mediation techniques. The agency aids communities at the request of state and local officials or other interested persons, or on its own motion when, in CRS' judgment, peaceful relations among community residents are threatened.

The Service has offices in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Kansas City, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Seattle. Assistance may be requested from any of these offices.

This publication is dedicated to the memory of Bertha Hudson, an educator who believed passionately in quality public education and equal educational opportunity. She gave unstintingly of her time, expertise, and remarkable intellectual creativity in support of those causes. Her loss will be felt by all who believe in equality and a sound public education system, or whose lives are somehow touched by our public schools.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

FOREWORD

This publication was prepared as a guide to dealing with school human relations problems. Its focus is leadership training. It describes one method of organizing and training teams of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and others to pursue desirable human relations goals.

The Community Relations Service first used this process in connection with the desegregation of elementary schools in Syracuse, New York. However, the techniques and materials developed can also be adapted to other human relations concerns, not just those associated with desegregation. For example, vandalism, cultural insensitivity, school closings, and drug abuse are among the problems that cause community anxiety or conflict, and potentially might be addressed using the Syracuse model.

The emphasis is on bringing together the schools and community to deal with a problem about which there is mutual concern. The key to that, of course, is having interested people who are committed to achieving goals that benefit the schools and all of the people they serve.

We hope that other communities find in Syracuse's experience useful guidance for addressing the problems they face.

Gilbert G. Pompa
Director
Community Relations Service

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD iii
INTRODUCTION 1
BACKGROUND 1
SCOPE AND GOAL OF CRS' INVOLVEMENT 3
THE WORKSHOPS 4
OUTCOME OF CRS' EFFORTS 9
LATER USES OF THE SYRACUSE MODEL 12
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Examples of Case Studies 17
Appendix B: Example of Value Clarification Exercise 18
Appendix C: Disruptive Behavior Exercises 19
Appendix D: Checklist for Diagnosing School Climate 21
Appendix E: School Plan Exercise 29

INTRODUCTION

Schools are constantly affected by change of one kind or another. There is little today that remains exactly as it was even a decade ago. And when school systems must react to change—or its results—it is seldom a matter just for the top officials who run the schools.

Parents, teachers, students, staff members, and lower-level administrators also want to know how they, their schools, and their interests will be affected. Thoughtful persons in all of these groups try to make the responses to change as beneficial as possible to everyone affected. And often a key factor is mounting an effective human relations program.

The Community Relations Service (CRS) has amassed an extensive amount of experience and materials on human relations programs and strives for maximum assistance to schools. However, CRS realizes that all school systems have unique characteristics and face differing circumstances, and cannot be dealt with by a single set of remedies. Thus, the Service approaches the human relations problems of any school system with a flexibility and willingness to find solutions best suited to that particular system.

When in 1977 Syracuse, New York, school officials requested CRS' assistance in connection with desegregation of the city's elementary schools, the agency set out to develop a human relations training program geared specifically to Syracuse's needs. But CRS also recognizes the value of models which, because of their strengths, can serve as guides elsewhere, and the structure developed in Syracuse provided such a model. Not only was it effective in addressing that school system's human relations needs—as determined by the Service's own observations and an independent evaluation—at least four other localities have subsequently adapted the model to their own uses.

This publication describes the Syracuse program's objectives, development, implementation, and accomplishments. The approach is not that of a prescriptive, step-by-step manual. Nor is an attempt made to present an ordered chronology of every event during the months of activity. Emphasis is on setting forth mainly what was done—and the outcome—so that school officials in other cities may review Syracuse's experience for its potential usefulness in their own systems.

BACKGROUND

Syracuse is the fifth largest city in New York. It has a population of about 200,000, 12 percent of which is non-white. Blacks are the largest

minority group, comprising 10 percent of the city's population. Although Syracuse's general population remained relatively constant between 1960 and 1970, its non-white population more than doubled.

Unlike the general population, enrollment in the city's public schools has decreased more than 15 percent since the 1971-72 school year. But, as in the general population, the percentage of minority students has increased dramatically, almost doubling since 1965. By 1976, minorities comprised 31 percent of the 25,000 students enrolled in the Syracuse public schools, and approximately 35 percent of the 13,000 elementary school students. That trend—decreasing overall enrollment with an increasing percentage of minority students—has continued.

Desegregation of Syracuse's Elementary Schools

In September, 1977, the Syracuse City School District (SCSD), acting under a 1976 order from the state commissioner of education, integrated its elementary schools. The first year involved several major changes, including: closing 10 elementary schools and one junior high; altering the attendance boundaries of almost all remaining elementary schools; changing the grade structure in three elementary schools, three junior highs, and two senior highs; and creating one tandem and one magnet school (with a second magnet school planned).

Reorganization of the elementary schools affected assignments of students, faculty, administrators, and support staff, and changed the composition of the student body in all remaining schools. Desegregation was resisted to some extent, but nowhere near the point of planned or organized violence. Unlike some other cities, parents of children in predominately minority and predominately white schools came together under the aegis of Syracuse's District-Wide Advisory Council and developed a desegregation plan which was acceptable to the state.

In November, 1977, two months after the desegregation plan was implemented, the SCSD received a $922,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). The grant was to facilitate the desegregation process. It included funds for special instructional services, community programs, and human relations activities. The human relations portion of the grant provided for two full-time ombudspersons (who also performed instructional support services); community aides and additional teachers in each of the 19 eligible schools; and also a series of four human relations training workshops for teachers, administrators, and parents.

Request for CRS Aid

To implement the human relations training component, the SCSD Special Projects Office sought outside assistance. On November 17, 1977, SCSD staff contacted CRS' Northeast Regional Office for help in developing human relations training for approximately 1,000 administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and custodial staff.

In response, a mediator from that office and a headquarters education specialist met with school officials, and later with the District-Wide Advisory Council, to discuss how CRS could be of service, and to present ideas for the four human relations workshops. Syracuse's initial request was for help with the first workshop only. However, the CRS team, while indicating the agency's willingness to do just one workshop, stressed in its presentation how the Service could work with the school system to make all four fit together in one complementary package.

In mid-December, 1977, CRS received the go-ahead for the first workshop, and by the end of the month, had been asked to design all four. According to Special Projects Office staff, CRS was only one of a number of groups contacted. School staff said that the Service was chosen because of its flexibility, and its plan to design a program to meet Syracuse's needs rather than use a canned training package. The Special Projects Office also believed that CRS' proposed workshop design could help each school develop a process to support the ESAA project objective of bringing community people into the schools.

SCOPE AND GOAL OF CRS' INVOLVEMENT

As soon as CRS received the okay to develop all four workshops, it added a private education consultant to its Syracuse project team and stepped up the planning. The CRS team sought to design a program which, broadly stated, could create greater sensitivity to racial and cultural differences among the city's students; and build better relationships among students, teachers, administrators, school staff, and parents in support of a quality learning experience.

More specifically, the Service hoped that the workshops would result in each school establishing a human relations team to assume responsibility for helping groups adjust during the desegregation process, and in developing a plan for the 1978-1979 school year which addressed human relations problems identified during the workshops. CRS also hoped to help school staff members understand the impor-

tance of their roles as human relations models; to sensitize all workshop participants to the issues involved in desegregation; to increase their knowledge of what was done in other school systems; and to provide specific information on testing and achievement, curriculum, and multicultural materials.

Although the principal focus of CRS's activities was the workshops, its efforts involved more than the design and development of the four training sessions. The agency's team sought to identify needs and develop ongoing mechanisms for involving parents and the community in the schools; to provide informal education and training to help the ombudspersons define and carry out their role; and to get representatives of the Black, Native American, and Hispanic communities involved in the human relations project and to discuss their concerns in general.

It perhaps should be noted that the Service considered the Syracuse project important because the development and emphasis of the desegregation plan was significantly different from the majority of desegregation efforts in which CRS had been involved, and could represent the norm for future desegregation. First, the plan involved desegregation of elementary schools in a system whose secondary schools were already desegregated. Most of the agency's previous experience had been with desegregation of secondary schools or whole systems.

Secondly, the Syracuse plan was developed under an order from the state commissioner of education rather than under court order, as is usual in most CRS cases. Finally, the Syracuse plan was developed by its District-Wide Advisory Council, which involved white and minority parents in the process, and there was no planned or organized resistance. In a number of other school districts, CRS had been called upon to help counter overt resistance or violence—or at least the threat of it.

THE WORKSHOPS

Syracuse's original workshop plan called for schools in four sections of the city to meet together, respectively, in plenary-type sessions, with parents attending as observers. CRS proposed that this concept be changed to permit each school to develop its own human relations team of staff and parents to identify major concerns and develop a plan to address them.

The Service suggested that each team be composed of an administrator, teachers, community aides, and parents, and that one of the

four workshops be used specifically for intensive training of these teams. The school system and the District-Wide Advisory Council approved this concept, and the result was the workshop training design described below.

Workshop I (February 11, 1978)

This was a plenary session attended by over 1,000 persons, including 533 administrators and teachers, 49 parents, and 288 paraprofessionals, secretaries, and custodians. Its goals were to sensitize participants to broad integration issues, to allow them to hear the experiences of other cities, and to explain the purpose of the other workshops. The focal point of this initial session was a keynote address on issues in desegregation by Dr. Paul Zuber, Director of Urban Environmental Studies at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York, and a panel discussion on five cities' experiences with desegregation.

The afternoon was devoted entirely to the panel discussion. The cities discussed and the persons who represented them were:

- *Boston*—James M. O'Sullivan, parent, Co-chairman of the Citywide Education Coalition, and Director of South Boston Neighborhood House.
- *Buffalo*—Evelyn Cooper, Supervising Elementary School Principal, and in charge of an ESAA-funded human relations project.
- *Cincinnati*—William Dupree, Director of Secondary Education for that city's schools, and a former junior high and senior high principal.
- *Dayton*—Phyllis B. Greer, instructor at the University of Dayton, member of desegregation boards in five cities, and national desegregation consultant; and Reverend Kent M. Organ, former member of the Dayton Citizens Advisory Board, a court-appointed, desegregation-monitoring body, and pastor of a multiracial United Presbyterian Congregation.
- *Louisville*—Carolyn Hutto, member of the Louisville-Jefferson County Board of Education, and of the National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies, sponsored by the Education Commission of the States.

An opportunity was provided for participants to question the speakers. Most of the questions dealt with involvement of parents, the role of community aides, and teacher activities in the classroom. A group luncheon, arranged as part of the session, was a further aid to discussion and information-sharing.

Workshop II (March 11, 1978)

This was actually 20 simultaneous workshops, one for each participating school, and an extra session for interested parents and others not belonging to any of the 19 school groups. These mini-workshops were designed to begin the team-building process in each school and to prepare teams to conduct Workshop II in turn. Each of the 20 workshops was conducted by a facilitator from CRS's field staff, recruited from the agency's other regional offices to assist the Syracuse project team.

The agency hoped in these workshops to impart the skills needed to begin developing a school human relations plan, to inform the participants about sources of multicultural materials, and to promote interaction among the teams. In preparation, facilitators met the day before in their own eight-hour training session. The CRS project team briefed the facilitators on the city, its desegregation effort, the Service's role, and the school at which each would be working. The team also instructed them on the use of exercises specially prepared for the workshops. The facilitators subsequently led participants at their assigned schools through the exercises.

These exercises were the key element of Workshop II. There were five main segments: Case Studies in Crisis Prevention and Response; Value Clarification; Problem-Solving Related to Disruptive Behavior and Responses; Diagnosing the School Climate; and Developing a School Plan. The purpose, procedure, and content of each segment are described below. (For examples of the exercises, see appendices.)

Case Studies in Crisis Prevention and Response

The purpose of this segment was to have participants discuss responsibilities and activities of the school, parents and students, and the community in preventing crises, and responding to them if they do occur. Participants were asked to develop activities and techniques to keep lines of communication open among various segments of the school community, establish coalitions, influence school policy, and build community support for public education.

Each participant was given 15 case studies to read based on actual occurrences in other school systems undergoing desegregation. The cases dealt with disputes over discipline, student assignments, representation of parent-teacher groups, and other school policies and practices. The participants were then asked to respond to two basic questions in connection with most of the case studies: If this situation occurred in your school, how would you handle it? What could be done in your school system to minimize the likelihood of such an oc-

currence? The case studies were designed to stimulate discussion and to get the group to think about roles and responsibilities.

Value Clarification

This segment was designed to test the values used in teaching, and the subjectiveness of certain school policies and procedures. Participants were asked to complete exercises involving: (1) administering an arithmetic test to sixth grade students; (2) evaluating grades given to seven children, based on descriptions of their performances provided; and (3) minimum standards for promotion.

The participants then discussed reasons for the differences in their responses, why differences occur in the school, and– in light of such differences—how students and their parents are to know what is expected of students. The value clarification segment and the following segment on problem-solving were designed to get people to look at their own value system, examine the implications for the classroom, and to try to reach some consensus on classroom issues. The CRS facilitators were asked not to be judgmental in conducting these segments.

Problem-Solving Related to Disruptive Behavior and Responses

Here, the participants were given an opportunity to compare their definitions of disruptive student behavior and appropriate responses. Exercises were designed to illustrate that:

- Behavior and responses to it vary according to the situation.
- Interpretations of disrespect, insubordination, and disruptive behavior are subjective and something about which all teachers are not likely to agree.
- A teacher's behavior can positively or negatively influence the behavior of students in the classroom.

Participants were asked to complete exercises on disruptive behavior and responses to disruptive behavior. Then a consensus was sought on what problems might be indicated by student disrespect, insubordination, and disruptive behavior. Participants also discussed actions which encourage appropriate behavior in the classroom as well as other areas of the school.

Diagnosing the School Climate

This segment's purpose was to prepare the participants to evaluate their school with emphasis on overall intercultural awareness and sensitivity. They were given a checklist by which to gauge the school's

preparedness. The results thus obtained were to serve as a guide for effecting improvements.

Developing a School Plan

In this segment, participants were asked to begin the actual process of developing school plans, using diagnostic instruments and worksheets provided. They were required to look at the school's instructional program, its environment, school-community relationships, and staff development. Assessment instruments were provided for each category.

Participants were asked to make at least one commitment in each area. Then for each commitment listed, they were asked to set down such factors as helping and hindering forces, activities and strategies to accomplish the desired objectives, persons who could be involved, and target dates. It was stressed that plans should include community representatives and take into account all school staff, including clerks, cafeteria workers, and custodial staff.

Workshop III (March 18, 1978)

On this occasion there were separate workshops at 19 participating schools. Each was conducted by the teams trained in Workshop II. CRS expected the teams to use the materials presented in the second workshop (although schools were encouraged to modify specific activities to meet their needs), and to begin diagnosing school human relations problems and developing a plan for addressing them.

Approximately 600 people, ranging from 12 to 60 per school, attended these sessions. CRS hoped that participants at each school would get a better understanding of each other's viewpoints and concerns, aiding development of the school's plan. The Service's three-member project team, one other private consultant to CRS, and the school system's ombudspersons were available to help out in individual schools, but planning of the workshops was left to the teams trained in Workshop II.

Workshop IV (April 1, 1978)

Participants met again in their own schools. The first part of the workshop was devoted to a three-hour, televised panel presentation on testing and achievement, curriculum, and use of multicultural materials. The program was broadcast over Syracuse's educational television channel and seen in surrounding communities as well as the city. Viewers could call in their questions. In the afternoon the teams continued working on their school plans.

Curriculum Materials

The core of the workshops' curriculum was the manual of exercises developed by the CRS project team. In addition to the exercises, it contained an overview of the workshop series' goals and objectives, and resource materials sugesting possible activities schools could undertake. Resource materials also included bibliographical information.

The design and content of the exercise manual were reviewed by the staff of the school system's Special Projects Office, and some cases were eliminated at their request. The school staff thought the case studies in question could be inflammatory and lacked relevance to Syracuse's situation. There was also some objection to using racial designations in the case studies, but ultimately it was agreed that the designations were needed.

OUTCOME OF CRS' EFFORTS

The workshops started a process in the Syracuse elementary schools which, according to a majority of school officials subsequently queried, increased participants' awareness of desegregation issues, stimulated ideas for schools to make integration work, and spurred the development of desegregration-related school plans for the 1978-1979 school year. CRS was not significantly involved in later in-service workshops during the summer and fall of 1978. However, administrators and staff at the 19 schools saw these subsequent workshops as an outgrowth of the CRS series.

The Syracuse school system received permission in the spring of 1978 to use ESAA funds to pay teachers to attend a five-day, in-service workshop. Design of the workshops was left up to the individual school. However, the Special Projects Office recommended that one day each be devoted to the following topics: parent involvement methodology for the upcoming school year; instructional organization of the school program; second-year integration strategies; human relations among staff members; and functions among elementary schools in four sections of the city.

Sixteen of seventeen participating schools used their summer workshop to continue planning and team-building started in the CRS workshop series. The seventeenth school, which was to become a magnet shcool, used its workshop to get organized. (Two other schools chose to hold their workshop in the fall because staff members were not available during the summer.) Each workshop produced some form of

plan designed to serve as a guide for school operations and activities when students returned in the fall.

School Plans

Schools developed three types of plans. Some consisted of a series of products to be used, such as disciplinary procedures, behavior codes, bus and cafeteria regulations, letters to be sent to parents, and multicultural materials for the classroom. A second type of plan listed activities to bring parents into the school, increase parent-teacher contact generally, and otherwise improve group and personal interaction. (Examples of such planned activities included a survey of parents, publishing a school newspaper, holding evening "United Nations" programs, and convening assemblies to present information about different cultures.) Other plans set specific goals and objectives for the 1978-1979 school year and outlined the steps to achieve them.

When later asked about implementation of the plans and how important they were to school activities, school staff responded without exception that the plans played a significant role. Several persons commented that their school's plan helped to make people more accountable. A number said that they believed in their plan because they personally had been involved in developing it.

School Teams

By the time schools opened in the fall of 1978, all but two of the 19 schools had teams in place. (The one magnet school said the entire faculty operated as a team. The other school said its team would be reconsituted to plan for in-service training.) The teams varied from school to school, but there were mainly three models: (1) a small, permanent administrative group to facilitate desegregation efforts; (2) committees which addressed specific issues, with committee chairpersons functioning as a team to build support and cooperation among staff; and (3) separate teams to address specific issues and concerns and report back to the principal or staff.

Although the school teams operated differently, they were generally seen as instrumental in identifying the need for continual, significant parental involvement, and in identifying ways to meet this need. In addition, the teams with representatives from different groups within the school and community have generally developed into advisory groups for principals and staff.

In some schools, teams have met weekly or biweekly. Other schools indicated that their teams meet informally and as necessary. Most members have served on teams because of their positions in the school

or because they volunteered. In some instances, principals appointed team members.

Ombudspersons' Activities

The two ombudspersons' responsibilities include developing and implementing procedures and activities to facilitate desegregation, serving as a resource for schools and their teams, and coordinating some activities of community aides. CRS' project team worked with the ombudspersons on several occasions. For example, early in the 1978-1979 school year, the Service sponsored visits for them to the school systems of Dallas, Tampa, and Memphis.

These visits gave the ombudspersons an opportunity to observe first-hand other school systems in which desegregation had been effectively implemented. The visits also provided a chance to confer directly with persons who had been involved in the diverse problems of the desegregation process. Such exchanges have been invaluable in similar situations.

An example of a project originated by the ombudspersons is a community-based, student-parent services center. The superintendent authorized implementation of the idea after exploring it with CRS. The center, located in an apartment complex, was to tutor students after school and serve as a meeting place for school-community activities. It had the advantage of being in a familiar, easily accessible location. School personnel believed the center would be of value to students and their parents in the desegregation process.

In summary, CRS hoped that its workshops would result in each elementary school doing at least two things: establishing a human relations team to assume primary responsibility for helping groups adjust during desegregation, and developing a plan for the 1978-1979 school year which addressed the problems identified. Although teams and plans took a variety of forms, the workshop series started a planning and team-building process which developed a momentum of its own. That process resulted in schools taking specific steps to improve human relations, increase parental involvement, promote better staff and student understanding of other cultures, and facilitate the integration process.

Of course, the long-term benefits for Syracuse can only be determined over time. But the city's school system clearly has enhanced the prospect of maintaining a quality public education system sensitive to all groups in the Syracuse population.

LATER USES OF THE SYRACUSE MODEL

The human relations training structure developed in Syracuse has subsequently been used by school systems or groups in Colorado, Missouri, Texas, and California. In the first two instances, the concern was general problems related to race and intergroup relations. In the latter cases, interest was prompted specifically, as in Syracuse, by school desegregation.

Colorado Education Association

For several years the Colorado Education Association (CEA) has sponsored summer leadership conferences to improve the skills of its 24,000 members and to make them more productive members of the communities they serve. One of five workshops in the 1978 leadership conference, which was attended by 150 CEA members August 7-11 at Snowmass, Colorado, focused on ways to improve human relations in schools. Forty-five persons participated in that three-day session (for which they received college credit). Participants chose this workshop because they were assigned to—or particularly interested in—improving relationships among staff, students, and others in their own school districts.

Colorado has in recent years experienced rapid changes in the enrollment of students from differing ethnic backgrounds. Resulting pressures have demonstrated a need for greater understanding of human differences—and the responsibility that every school staff member bears for the school racial climate. Improving relations among all persons who are part of the school community, regardless of racial, cultural, or sexual differences, is a primary CEA goal. The association asked CRS to conduct the human relations workshop at the 1978 leadership conference because of the agency's extensive experience in the field.

The session was planned by a joint, CRS-CEA team. The major focus was to help the 45 participants develop, or sharpen, problem-solving skills which they could put to use back home. Training was structured to achieve that through a combination of the exercises used in Syracuse, presentations by experts on conflict management and the process of change, and other means. The workshop planners hoped to teach participants about group dynamics, problem-solving techniques, and communication skills; to develop increased intercultural awareness and sensitivity; to improve their skills in dealing with student-teacher conflict; and accomplish other specific objectives.

University City, Missouri

University City, a suburb of St. Louis, has used the Syracuse model, with CRS' help, as one approach to dealing with a multifaceted human relations problem. Although the city's general population is predominately white, its student population is predominately black. A blue ribbon committee has cited the need to reverse a trend of conditions in the schools involving disruptive behavior, distrust between black and white staff, lack of parental involvement, and other matters. School teams organized as a result of workshops CRS conducted in 1978 remain intact. Made up of school staff and community members, the teams are used as a mechanism to address many of the school system's difficulties.

Lubbock, Texas

With 2,000 elementary and 300 secondary school students to be bused for the first time, in August, 1978, Lubbock made a concerted effort to insure peaceful implementation of desegregation. A part of that effort was a three-day workshop, based on the Syracuse model, which a CRS team conducted for 45 teachers, three from each of 15 schools to which students were being bused. Lubbock school officials believed the teams would help to promote better human relations in their respective schools, and also provide a vital link for system-wide communication and problem-solving.

San Bernadino, California

San Bernadino's interest in human relations training also stemmed from its desire to cope effectively with the impact of desegregation. For some time, the school system has pursued an active program to achieve objectives such as improving relationships between teachers and students, and breaking down barriers between students of diverse racial, ethnic, national origin, cultural, and religious heritage. CRS conducted a human relations workshop for 25 of the system's teachers in October, 1978. In the course of that workshop, two school plans patterned on those promulgated in Syracuse were developed as general examples that could serve as guides for all schools in the San Bernadino school system.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLES OF CASE STUDIES

• A parent group has charged a second grade teacher with 60 specific instances of discrimination against black children. The group also contends that on 20 occasions its grievances were communicated in person or by letter to school officials but no action was taken. The parents allege that the teacher has been abusive and disrespectful toward black students and parents, employed arbitrary and capricious disciplinary measures, shown disregard for the safety and well-being of children, and manifested a generally racist attitude. The parent group wants the teacher removed and is picketing the school. The teachers' union supports retention of the teacher.

What are some of the problems likely to occur in the school because of this situation?

• Parents are protesting the corporal punishment administered a 10-year-old Chicano girl by a white teacher. They allege that the punishment was the result of language and cultural differences, that the teacher misunderstood something that the child had said. Some 40 Chicano parents have staged a sit-in.

What activities and resources could be used to minimize the possibility of such an incident occurring?

What are some of the problems employees such as the school clerk face as a result of this situation?

What problems might erupt in an area of the school such as the cafeteria?

• A group of white parents pickets the school board, demanding a split shift at their children's present elementary school in place of a plan to bus them to a school four miles away. While the parents contend that their only objection is to the busing, some have other children who are bused to middle school without objections. It is clear that the present objection stems from the new school's location in the heart of the black community.

What activities and resources could be used to minimize the possibility of such an incident occurring?

If it did happen, what activities could be undertaken, and what resources used, to resolve it?

APPENDIX B: EXAMPLE OF VALUE CLARIFICATION EXERCISE

Seven Children

Following are brief descriptions of seven children who received a "D" in English on their last last report cards. Read the descriptions and indicate whether these students could have gotten a "D" (assuming this as the lowest passing grade) in your class or school for the reasons given. If you are not an English teacher, consider the descriptions from the standpoint of your own field. If the student in question could have received the lowest passing grade in your school for the reasons given, circle "yes"; if not, circle "no."

1. Yes No
2. Yes No
3. Yes No
4. Yes No
5. Yes No
6. Yes No
7. Yes No

As soon as you have completed your response, hand in this sheet for tabulation.

1. Charles is just not very bright. He tries hard but barely has enough ability to get by in school.

2. Willie is bright enough, but he is lazy. He knows when he has done enough to earn a "D." After that, he stops working.

3. Wailan is bright but is handicapped because English is not spoken in his home. He barely earns a "D," but should do better when his command of the English language improves.

4. Ken is probably a "C" student in English, but he is such a disciplinary problem that his teacher is not inclined to give him the benefit of any doubt. Hence he gets a "D."

5. Chester does "A" or "B" work when he is in school, but he is absent so much that he barely makes a "D."

6. Barney does "B" or "C" work in English literature, but his composition is atrocious. So his marks average out at "D."

7. Ben is doing far below passing work, but he flunked English last year, and we see no point in failing him more than once in the same subject.

APPENDIX C: DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR EXERCISE

Disruptive Behavior

By yourself, list 10 actions that you regard as unacceptable school behavior.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

By yourself, define the student actions indicated by the following terms.

1. Disrespect
2. Insubordination
3. Disruptive Behavior

Resonses to Disruptive Behavior

By yourself, list 10 examples of what you consider effective responses to unacceptable classroom behavior.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

By yourself, rank your responses from the most effective (1) to least effective (10).

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Classroom Behavior

By yourself, list 10 things that you do in your classroom which seem to encourage appropriate student behavior.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

By yourself, list 10 things that occur in your school which seem to encourage appropriate student behavior.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

APPENDIX D: CHECKLIST FOR DIAGNOSING THE SCHOOL CLIMATE

Please respond to the following statements by placing a check in the column which you think indicates your school's status.

Curriculum—Instructional Program	YES	NO	UNKNOWN
1. This school follows written guidelines for the selection of multiethnic/multicultural materials.			
2. Instructional materials treat the various racial/ethnic groups honestly, realistically, and sensitively.			
3. Materials and content in the various curriculum areas avoid racial and ethnic stereotypes.			
4. Materials on minorities are an integral part of each curriculum rather than attached or treated separately.			
5. Multiethnic/multicultural materials are readily available to all students in a range of interest and reading levels.			
6. Racial/ethnic minorities are involved in the selection and review of materials for multiracial/ethnic content.			
7. Staff members continually receive in-service education relative to use of multiracial/ethnic materials.			
8. This school continues to carefully preview, review, and update all textbooks and other instructional media to guarantee the elimination of racial and sex discrimination.			
9. Special help in basic skills is provided for students requiring this help as they move into an integrated school setting.			
10. The curriculum reflects the ethnic learning styles of all students within the schools.			

Curriculum—Instructional Program (Continued)

11. Grouping, class scheduling, and student assignment policies do not inhibit multiracial/ethnic interaction.			
12. Multiethnic/multicultural education permeates the school's entire program.			
13. The curriculum is designed to help students learn how to function in a pluralistic society.			
14. Conflict resolution skills are taught and universally applied by staff in real-life situations.			
15. The staff avoids labeling students with regard to their racial and ethnic background.			
16. Assessment instruments that are as culture-free as possible are used for diagnosis of individuals and for determination of appropriate instructional sequence.			
17. The school teaches and exemplifies the acceptance of persons on the basis of individual worth regardless of sex, race, religion or socioeconomic background.			
18. The school presents group differences in ways that cause students to look upon the multicultural character of our nation as a value to be esteemed.			
19. This school seeks to motivate students to examine their own attitudes and behavior as related to different ethnic/racial groups.			
20. Special help is provided for students whose dominant language is not English.			
21. Historic, cultural, and intellectual contributions of all minority groups are included as an integral part of the curriculum.			

School Environment	YES	NO	UNKNOWN
1. Pictures, posters, displays, and school communication reflect various racial and ethnic groups.			
2. The atmosphere of the building is conducive to involvement and visitation by parents of all racial groups.			
3. This school maintains and enforces the same standards of conduct for all students.			
4. Each member of this staff is committed to the total integration of the school.			
5. If there is an excess of tardiness, dropouts, or absences in this school for a particular racial/ethnic group, a program has been developed to remedy this.			
6. Most classes, including exceptional education, reflect the racial/ethnic composition of this school.			
7. To avoid resegregation within the school, any ability grouping arrangement is flexible and applies to the specific ability which is taught in the grouping.			
8. The staff of this school is as concerned about all students taking advantage of educational opportunities as they are about making educational opportunities available.			
9. Most extracurricular participation reflects the racial/ethnic composition of the school.			
10. The year's calendar of outside speakers and assemblies includes some that reflect the multicultural nature of our society.			
11. Bulletin boards in this building avoid using racial/ethnic pictures which reflect stereotypes.			

School Environment (Continued)

12. Students of all races and ethnic groups are significantly involved in planning curricular and extracurricular activities.			
13. Students in this school do not consistently move toward racial or ethnic groups in out-of-class situations.			
14. Grouping, class scheduling, and student assignment policies promote multiracial/multiethnic interaction.			
15. The food services department respects the food choices of the multiethnic make-up of the school and includes appropriate items on the menu.			
16. No student is denied participation in extracurricular activities because of financial disability.			
17. There are school goals and instructional programs related to integration for the playground, hallways, buses, and lunchrooms as well as the classroom, and this total school staff is involved in these instructional programs.			
18. Students are given opportunities to express, celebrate, and maintain ethnic and racial differences.			
19. Academic and social honors in leardership positions of this student body and staff reflect the pluralism of the community.			
20. Students of one racial/ethnic group are not afraid of students of other racial/ethnic groups.			
21. All pupils in this school feel free to express their ideas and feelings.			
22. Pupils in this school feel relaxed about mixing with pupils of different racial or ethnic backgrounds.			

School Environment (Continued)

23. The school encourages students from all racial groups to participate in all curricular and extracurricular activities.			
24. Transportation arrangements following after-school activities are provided for the students who are usually transported to insure participation by all students.			

School/Community

1. Efforts are make by this school's staff to make sure that all parents feel welcome and comfortable at the school.			
2. The district's PTA officers reflect the pluralism of the community.			
3. This school's parent committees and groups reflect the pluralism of the community.			
4. This district's parent committees and groups reflect the pluralism of the community.			
5. Parents who are representative of the school's population participate in school activities.			
6. Parents of each child, regardless of racial/ethnic background, are notified when their child has a behavior or academic problem.			
7. Efforts are made to reduce the isolation or stigma of students who ride the bus to school for desegregation purposes.			
8. This school communicates regularly with all parents.			
9. Students are not verbally identified by race or ethnic group for negative purposes.			

School/Community (Continued)			
10. This school encourages teachers to meet with all parents at a time and place that is convenient for the parents.			
11. This school utilizes opportunities in the community to broaden the understanding and practice of pluralism.			
12. Parents from all racial/ethnic groups are encouraged to actively participate in discussion of school and school/community problems, and in the planning of school affairs.			
13. Parents of all racial/ethnic groups are involved in improving human relations in the school.			
14. This school welcomes opportunities to meet with parents who have questions about the desegregation/integration process.			
15. Adult volunteers for school-related jobs reflect this school's population.			
16. Communications (TV, radio, newspapers, newsletters, and student publications) reflect the school's multiethnic/racial make-up.			
Staff			
1. The total school staff is representative of the racial/ethnic composition of the district.			
2. The staff meets and visits with parents at a time convenient to the parents.			
3. In-service work, discussions with colleagues, and selected readings help to make this staff equipped to offer services to a multiethnic/racial student population.			

Staff (Continued)

4. Staff members openly recognize racial and cultural biases in themselves and students, and attempt to overcome them.			
5. All staff members in the school building—not just minority staff members—deal with minority students' problems.			
6. All staff members in this building are expected to deal with minority parents and community members.			
7. This staff interacts with colleagues regardless of racial/ethnic background.			
8. The expectations of this staff for student academic achievement are not based on the students' racial/ethnic background.			
9. All staff members are included in the school's professional and social activities.			
10. Staff members do not condone racial or ethnic slurs in the form of jokes or other comments.			
11. Changes in federal or state laws relating to minority education are promptly interpreted and displayed for all personnel in the school building.			
12. District-wide minority administrators hold positions of general responsibility rather than positions relating specifically to federal programs, minority concerns, or minority relations.			
13. Staff promotions and assignments, curricular and extracurricular, are handled on the basis of merit rather than racial or ethnic considerations.			
14. There is recruitment of staff from all racial and ethnic groups.			

Staff (Continued)

15. This staff takes advantage of, and seeks out, in-service educational opportunities related to human relations and multicultural education.			
16. All staff members are oriented to the school, community, and its various neighborhoods.			
17. In this school, all staff members, regardless of racial/ethnic background,are free to express their ideas and feelings.			
18. This building's administration takes leadership in the development of school integration activities.			

APPENDIX E: SCHOOL PLAN EXERCISE

Instructions: Now is the time, based on the needs of your school/community, to identify concerns and make commitments toward improvement in the following areas:

1. Community Involvement
2. School Environment
3. Curriculum
4. Staff Development

Although your group can make as many commitments as it feels needs to be accomplished to strengthen your school/community, you should have at least one commitment under each topic area. Make sure your plan involves the community and all school personnel such as clerks and cafeteria workers. Be prepared to share your plan with the total group at the end of the day.

SCHOOL PLAN

School _____

STATEMENT OF CONCERNS	Hindering Forces	Helping Forces	Activities, Procedures, and Strategies to Achieve Workable Objectives	Persons to Be Involved in Activities
Community Involvement				
School Environment				
Curriculum				
Staff Development				

What Will They Do?	Who Will Have the Major Leadership Responsibility?	Target Dates for Each Activity	What Evaluation Tool or Technique Will Be Used to Determine the Effectiveness of the Activities?

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1980 O—311-378/1499

CRS REGIONAL OFFICES

NEW ENGLAND
Room 1920
100 S mmer Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 223-5170

NORTHEAST
Room 3402
26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10007
(212) 264-0700

MID-ATLANTIC
Room 309
2nd & Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 597-2344

SOUTHEAST
Room 900
75 Piedmont Avenue, NE
Altanta, GA 30303
(404) 221-6883

MIDWEST
Room 1113
175 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago,IL 60603
(312) 353-4391

SOUTHWEST
Room 13B-35
1100 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75242
(214) 767-0824

CENTRAL
Room 2411
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 374-2022

ROCKY MOUNTAIN
Fourth Floor
1531 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 837-2973

WESTERN
Room 1050
1275 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 556-2485

NORTHWEST
Room 1898
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174
(206) 442-4465

HEADQUARTERS
Room 640
550 11th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 724-7352